prenuers in taxtiles and garments designing during the last two years by the State Trading Corporation;

(b) whether STC also proposes to conduct such type of workshops to specialise such women who have got vocational courses training, to have viability in export for textiles and garments; and

(c) whether State Trading Corporation is doing textile's export directly or on commission basis; if so, what are the details in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI): (a) and (b) STC has not organised any workshop during the last two years to specialise women entreprenuers in textile and garment designing. There is also no proposal to conduct such workshops for specialising women who have got vocational courses training.

(c) STC does not export textiles directly. Exports of textile and garment items are made by STC through its associate exporters/suppliers. For such exports, STC receives service charges depending upon the nature of items exported.

Setting up of a Cashew Board

3445. SHRI THOMAS KUTHIRAVATTOM: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to set up a Cashew Board; and

(b) if so, what are the details in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI): (a) A proposal for the setting up of a Cashew Board is under the consideration of the Government of India.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

Visit of World Bank Vice-President to Kerala and Rajasthan

3446. SHRI THOMAS KUTHIRAVATTOM: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what is the outcome of the visits by the Vice-President of the World Bank to Kerala and Rajasthan States; and

(b) whether Kerala State will be getting some additional funds as a result of his visit there and if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) and (b) Mr. Attila Karaosmanoglu, Vice President Asia Division, World Bank visited India from 18th to 31st January, 1989. During this period he visited Kerala from 22nd to 24th January, 1989 and Rajasthan from 26th to 29th January, 1989. The purpose of his visit was to acquaint himself with India's development programmes and policies. The specific project proposals of individual States were not discussed with him.

Classification of Ramanathapuram as 'C' Class City

3447. SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Ramanathapuram (Tamil Nadu) City satisfies the requirements for being declared as 'C' Class City;

(b) whether representations have been received from Central Government Employees' Coordination Committee, Ramanathapuram for declaring the Ramanathapuram City as 'C' Class City; and

(c) if so, what is Central Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EXPENDITURE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. K. GADHVI): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) As Ramanathapuram does not qualify for classification as a 'C' Class City on the basis of its population, it is not possible to declare Ramanathapuram as a 'C' Class city.

Joint complaint against assault on a trade union activist in Chandigarh

3448. SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that various Opposition Political Parties of Chandigarh, submitted a joint complaint dated the 24th February, 1989 to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh protesting against murderous assault on a trade union activist belonging to CITU, by goondas allegedly engaged by Pahwa Chains Industries Group, Chandigarh; and

(b) if so, the details of the incident and the steps taken by the Chandigarh Administration to apprehend the cluprits?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) M/s. Pahwa Chains Industries Group had some labour problems. Some workers had gone on strike whereas some continued to work. Due to this, there was tension between these two groups of workers. Preventive action to maintain public peace and order was taken against both the parties as per law. In the meantime, as per agreement reached between the striking workers and the Management, striking workers also joined their duties. However, on 22-2-89 both the groups again indulged in criminal activities in which Shri Mohammed Shahnaz CITU activist and Shri Achhar Singh, a worker belonging to management group sustained minor injuries. Both of them were medically examined. According to the medical report the injuries they had on their person, were of simple and blunt nature and as such, no cognizable offence was made out. However, two cross criminal cases have been registered against each other.

Permission for protest by C.P.I.(M) Punjab

3449. SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chandigarh Administration denied permission to the peaceful protest by the Punjab State Committee of CPI(M) for focussing the failure of Government to give adequate relief to the flood affected people recently; and

(b) if so, what are the reasons for denial of the permission?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV): (a) and (b) The Punjab State Committee of the C.P.I.(M) had sought permission to take out procession from Parade Ground, Sector 17 to Civil Secretariat and to stage dharna there for focussing the alleged inadequate relief provided to the flood affected people. The area of proposed procession route and dharna falls under the security zone. Moreover, prohibitary orders were also in force. There was, therefore, every possibility of infiltration of terrorists in the processionist Groups with the intention to distrub public peace in the sensitive Union Territory. Keeping all these factors in view, the permission was not granted.

Allowances admissible to workers in MITCO factories

3450. SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Shift allowance is given to the Staff but not to the workers in the MITCO factories; if so, what are the reasons for this discrimination;

(b) whether it is also a fact that LTC and picnic allowance are also different for the Staff and the workers of MITCO; if so, what are the reasons therefor; and